


Appl. No. 09/920,756
Amdt. dated June 11, 2008
Reply to Office Action of 12/13/2007

Remarks

The present amendment accompanies an Appeal Brief filed in response to the Official Action dated December 13, 2007. Claim 4 is amended to respond to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 of the final Official Action which noted there was insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation "said storage device" in line 12. "Said storage device" has been corrected to read "said second local storage device" consistent with line 8 of claim 4. Claims 1, 4 and 17 are amended to correct informalities noted by the Applicants. More particularly, in the Amendment filed September 26, 2007, as a result of a typographical error, the "a" was not struck through leaving "a a second local". Claim 1 is amended to delete the repetitious "a" at claim 1, line 8, correcting this typographical error. The same change has been made in claim 4 at line 8. In claim 17, lines 7 and 11, it was noted that "the computer system" should read "the POS terminal" consistent with the antecedent base found at claim 17, lines 4 and 5 which read "performing an automated search by the terminal to determine if a storage device is connected to the POS terminal" (emphasis added). Because this Amendment places the application in better form for appeal without requiring further searching or analysis by the Examiner, entry of the present Amendment is requested.

Appl. No. 09/920,756
Amdt. dated June 11, 2008
Reply to Office Action of 12/13/2007

Respectfully submitted,



Peter H. Priest
Reg. No. 30,210
Priest & Goldstein, PLLC
5015 Southpark Drive, Suite 230
Durham, NC 27713-7736
(919) 806-1600